

**REMARKS**

**Status of Application**

Claims 1-49 are the claims that have been examined in the instant application. Claims 1-7, 22-23, 26-33, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kazuto (JP 08-032461 A). Claims 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazuto. Claims 9-21, 36-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazuto as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 7, 26, 29, 33 above, and further in view of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,047 B2). Claims 8, 34-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent from including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

*Claims 8, 34-35 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent from including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.*

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 8 and 34-35 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. However, Applicants respectfully request that any rewriting be held in abeyance until the Examiner has had the opportunity to reconsider the prior art rejections of the other claims.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

*Claims 1-7, 22-23, 26-33, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kazuto (JP 08-032461 A).*

The Examiner provides an identical basis for rejection in the instant Office Action as was recited in the Office Action dated December 22, 2006. Thus, the following comments are directed toward the Examiner's Response to Arguments, found on pages 8-10 of the instant Office Action.

In response to Applicants' argument that Kazuto fails to disclose transmitting a relevant equipment key code to a relevant piece of electronic equipment, the Examiner argues that "[h]owever, Kazuto is not programmed to be directed toward a single device since Kazuto teaches that a memory stores the function for each button of the remote control transmitter for the particular device for the particular device that the remote control transmitter is directed toward." See Office Action, page 9.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "a remote-control signal transmitting section for transmitting a relevant equipment key code to a relevant piece of electronic equipment" and "an extension connection terminal portion comprising a data line for receiving the relevant key code when generated ... outside of said basic unit."

Kazuto discloses that a key of a first key section may be pressed, and the pressing of this key inputs a scanning signal to the remote control transmitter. See paragraph [0014]. Based on the key input (i.e. a power-source ON/OFF key for a piece of equipment), the control section searches the data memory for, and memorizes, a code for every key. See paragraph [0016] of

Kazuto. Thus, Kazuto fails to disclose that a relevant equipment key is transmitted *to a relevant piece of electronic equipment*, as recited in claim 1. Rather, the control section and optical output section detect the signal and assign the codes for each key of the remote control.

Further, with respect to Applicants' argument that Kazuto fails to disclose "an extension connection terminal portion comprising a data line for receiving the relevant key code when generated ... outside of said basic unit", the Examiner argues that "[w]hen the second key input section taught by Kazuto is attached to the first key input section, the memory contained in the first key input section contains the codes corresponding to the keys on the second key input section." See pages 9-10 of the instant Office Action. Thus, the Examiner alleges that the "first and second key sections transmit key code to the control section, and control section receives those codes, contrary to the statement of the Applicant's." See page 10 of the Office Action.

While Kazuto does disclose that the second input section receives codes from the first input section when the first and second sections are connected, Kazuto does not disclose that the extension connection terminal comprises a data line for receiving the relevant key code when generated ... *outside the basic unit*. Rather, Kazuto only discloses that the second key input section receives key codes generated *within* the basic unit. See paragraph [0020] ("signal processing, optical transmission, etc are not prepared in an extended key unit side").

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the applied art, as Kazuto fails to disclose all of the elements of claim 1. Claims 23 and 26 recite similar limitations to claim 1. Therefore, for reasons analogous to those noted in claim 1, claims 23 and 26 are patentable over the applied art. Specifically, both claims 23 and 26 recite relevant key code generated outside of the basic unit,

while as noted above, Kazuto only teaches key function codes generated *within* the first key input section. Claims 27-33 and 49 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

*Claims 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazuto.*

Claims 24 and 25 recite similar limitations to claim 1. Therefore, because Kazuto fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, and because the defects noted in Kazuto are not cured, claims 24 and 25 are patentable for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 1.

Specifically, as noted above, the second key input section in Kazuto does not transmit an arbitrary key code to a comparison/determination section of the first key input section, as recited in claims 24 and 25.

*Claims 9-21 and 36-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kazuto as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 7, 26, 29 and 33 above, and further in view of Kobayashi (US 6,738,047).*


Claims 9-21 and 36-48 are dependent from claims 1 and 26. Because Kazuto fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 26, and because Kobayashi fails to cure the defects noted with respect to claims 1 and 26, claims 9-21 and 36-48 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Dion R. Ferguson  
Registration No. 59,561

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 8, 2007